

REMARKS

Please reconsider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 7-16 are pending in the referenced application. Claims 7, 10, 13, and 16 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 7, 10, and 13.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,125,405 (“Farges”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,515,440 (“Mooney”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner “must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference; ...” MPEP § 2143(A).

Claims 7-16

Turning to the rejection, claim 7 recites, in part, (i) an authentication device that includes a message storage device connected, using a first link ($I_1/0_1$), to a protected device, which includes a microprocessor card, (ii) a display device connected, using a second link ($I_2/0_2$), to the protected device, and (iii) where the first link and the second link are physically separate.

Turning to the rejection, Applicant asserts that neither Farges nor Mooney teach or suggest all the limitations recited in the independent claims 7, 10, 13, and 16.

Cited References Fail to Teach or Suggest Microprocessor Card

Neither Farges nor Mooney teaches or suggests a protected device including a microprocessor card for authenticating messages where the protected device is provided with two physically separate links - one input/output (I/O) link connecting the protected device to the storage device and one I/O link connecting the protected device to the display device.

Specifically, the Examiner has admitted that Farges fails to teach or suggest a device constituted by a microprocessor card. See Office Action mailed June 26, 2008, p. 3. Instead the Examiner relies on Mooney. Applicant asserts that Mooney fails to teach or suggest that which Farges lacks. In particular, the Examiner incorrectly relies on Mooney to teach a protected device constituting a microprocessor card for message authentication. See Office Action mailed June 26, 2008, p. 3. However, Mooney merely teaches a conventional card reader comprising a conventional smart card connected to a bootable computer responsible for security access to the computer. Mooney completely fails to teach or suggest a microprocessor card for authenticating a message

being an intermediary between the message storage device and the display device which are each connected to the microprocessor card via physically separate connections.

Cited References Fail to Teach or Suggest Physically Separate Connections

As discussed above, independent claim 7 requires, in part, two physically separate links – one connected to the storage device and one connected to the display device. Farges fails to teach or suggest that the links are separate as recited in independent claim 7. Rather, Farges discloses that the two connections are interconnected in the card reader as shown in Figure 1a. or that they share the same port as shown in Figure 1b. See also Farges, Col 3, lines 40-46. The two links in Farges are directly connected, corresponding to the same input and outputs. Accordingly, none of the teachings in Farges may be reasonably held to be equivalent to the two physically separate links recited in the claims.

Moreover, Mooney fails to teach or suggest that which Farges lacks as evidenced by the fact that Examiner only relies on Mooney to teach a card reader interface constituting a microprocessor card. See Office Action mailed June 26, 2008, p. 3.

In view of the above, Farges and Mooney whether viewed separately or in combination fail to teach all the limitations of independent claim 7. Further, independent claims 10, 13, and 16 include at least the same patentable limitations as independent claim 7 and, accordingly, are patentable over Farges and Mooney for at least the same reasons as independent claim 7. Dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 14

In addition to the arguments presented above, claims 11 and 14 are additionally patentable over the cited prior art for at least the following reason.

Dependent claim 11 recites, in part, that: “the only logic link between the commands/data circulating between said microprocessor card and said storage device on one hand and data circulating between said microprocessor card and said display device on the other hand, is the software of said card.”

In rejecting this claim, the Examiner relies on Farges to teach the microprocessor card software being the only logic link between the storage device and the display device. However, as discussed above, Farges teaches that the ports receiving data from the storage device and the display device are either interconnected or the same port. It logically follows that microprocessor card software cannot be the only logical link between a storage device and a display device’s physically separate connections to the microprocessor card if the two devices are directly connected.

Mooney fails to teach or suggest that which Farges lacks as evidenced by the fact that Mooney is relied upon to solely teach the protected device constituting a microprocessor card. See Office Action, pg. 3. Thus, Farges and Mooney whether viewed separately or in combination fail to teach all the limitations of claim 11. Because dependent claim 14 includes at least the same limitations as dependent claim 11, dependent claim 14 is patentable over Farges and Mooney for at least the same reasons as dependent claim 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0591, under Order No. 09669/009002 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09669/009002).

Dated: October 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Jonathan P. Osha/
Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant